In re: Van De Ven et al. Sêrial No.: 09/057,838 Filed: April 9, 1998

Page 10 of 11

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application as reflected in the Official Action mailed August 11, 2004. Applicants also appreciate the allowance of Claims 17-29 and 49-53 and the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 31-34, 42, 55-58 and 63.

The Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants wish to bring to the attention of the Examiner Information Disclosure Statements (IDS's) filed in the present application in April, 1998 and June, 2000. Applicants also wish to bring to the attention of the Examiner an IDS that is being filed concurrently with the present Amendment. Applicants request that the PTO-1449 forms accompanying these IDS's be initialed indicating consideration of these materials and the initialed PTO-1449s returned to Applicants.

The Claim Rejections

Claims 30, 35-39, 41, 43, 54, 59-62 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in light of United States Patent No. 5,583,351 to Brown and United States Patent No. 5,661, 074 to Tischler. Official Action, p. 2. Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in light of Brown, Tischler and United States Patent No. 5,115,286 to Camras *et al.* Official Action, p. 3.

Applicants have amended Claims 31 and 55 to write these claims in independent form. Applicants have also amended Claims 42 and 63 to write these claims in independent form. Applicants have cancelled Claims 30 and 54 and have amended respective ones of Claims 35-41, 43, 59-62 and 64 to depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claims 31 and 55. Accordingly, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is either indicated as allowed or as containing allowable subject matter or depends from an allowed claim or a claim indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections are moot.

The New Claims

Applicants have also have added new Claim 65. New Claim 65 recites that the red LED, the green LED and the blue LED each have their respective top contacts in the same

In re: Van De Ven et al. Serial No.: 09/057,838 Filed: April 9, 1998

Page 11 of 11

plane. New Claims 66 and 67 depend from new Claim 65 and recite that the blue LED and the green LED and the red LED have their respective bottom contact in substantially the same plane and that the top contacts and the bottom contacts are in different planes.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

It is not believed that an extension of time and/or additional fee(s)-including fees for net addition of claims-are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. In the event, however, that an extension of time is necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such an extension is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any additional fees believed to be due in connection with this paper may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-0220.

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy J. O'Sullivan Registration No. 35,632

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 10, 2004:

Traci A. Brown